

FINAL MINUTES

JOINT KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE/
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING

February 24, 1999
Doubletree Hotel
Eureka, California

8:00AM Joint meeting of the Klamath Fishery Management Council (KFMC) and Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force (TF)

A. Introductions and discussion of objectives for joint meeting (Chairs)

Members present:

David Bitts, California Salmon Fishing Industry, TF and KFMC
Kent Bulfinch, California In-River Sport Fishing Community, TF
LB Boydston, California Department of Fish and Game, KFMC
John Engbring, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, CA/NV Operations Office, TF
Mitch Farro, Humboldt County Board of Supervisors, TF
Troy Fletcher, Yurok Tribe, TF and KFMC
Paul Kirk, California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry, KFMC
Jim Lone, Pacific Fishery Management Council, KFMC
Dr. Donald O. McIsaac, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, KFMC Chair
Elwood Miller, Jr., Klamath Tribe, TF
Al Olson, U.S. Forest Service, Klamath National Forest, TF
Mike Orcutt, Hoopa Valley Tribe, TF and KFMC
Greg Bryant alternate for Don Reck, National Marine Fisheries Service, TF
Mike Rode, California Department of Fish and Game, TF
Don Russell, Klamath County Board of Supervisors, TF
Joan T. Smith, Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors, TF
Dan Viele, NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, KFMC
Keith Wilkinson, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, TF and KFMC

John Engbring made opening remarks for TF and Don McIsaac made opening remarks for the KFMC.

Objectives for the joint meeting were identified as: to discuss funding necessities, shortfalls, and solutions.

B. Additions to agenda

Fletcher wants to talk about common objectives of the TF and KFMC.

Farro wants to know how the KFMC is addressing the mid-program review.

Bitts wants to describe to TF how KFMC does their tasks and ask TF to describe missions accomplished in basin.

Yesterday's KFMC list of agenda items to include was:

- 1) Information exchange between TF and KFMC
- 2) Summary of recent meetings of KFMC
- 3) Flow issues
- 4) Discussion of management objectives for TF and KFMC

Decision: to do funding necessities first, then do the other issues. Do Agendum C and D together to brainstorm solutions.

C. Harvest monitoring needs

Fletcher: TF and KFMC need to have common objectives. We all need to be clear that restoration of viable fisheries with harvesting is a common objective. The solution is not to just stop harvesting.

Bulfinch: Don't disagree. TF does not understand what is needed for KFMC to complete its tasks. It would be useful for KFMC to tell TF what tools and data they need and how much it would cost, then ask for specific allocation from Congress.

Herger is interested in our agreed upon needs. These could be attached to the \$100 million item for restoring Pacific coast salmon. We should separate harvest management from habitat restoration and see what info is needed to collect on both and ID costs.

McIsaac: Good idea. Some of the data are good for both, we need to discuss this.

Fletcher: Common goals - we have lots of issues to discuss like: should we manage for the floor of 35,000 fish? Consider sub-basin stocks? Spend more time on issues and less on meeting business.
Is TF satisfied with KFMC actions?

Olson: Use of the floor as a goal versus setting a goal is a concern. We agree that the long-term goal is a productive fishery.

Bitts: The floor is not a goal, but a constraint from meeting the harvest goal. Any year we cannot make harvest goal, we manage for the floor.

McIsaac: What is the optimum number of fish in the basin is an important question. When data are finalized, maybe we should re-look at the question of population goals.

**General agreement that a list of harvest monitoring needs would be useful. Bitts provided his draft of these needs.

Boydston gave an historical overview. Prior to mid-70s there was no escapement or stock monitoring of Klamath salmon. Magnuson Act in 1977 mandated monitoring of salmon. California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) used own resources to monitor, then Trinity Restoration Act provided funding. Klamath Act of 1986 reaffirmed mandate to allocate fish and restore habitat, but not enough money to do the job. Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission agreed to seek funding for Klamath River monitoring as federal budget line item. We need to get Congress to help with these mandates.

Kirk would like to see us harness money coming from Congress by capsulizing our needs and coming up with an appropriate dialogue with our two supportive Congressional members (Herger and Thompson).

Bulfinch suggested that a letter be prepared and signed by non-federal TF members outlining needs and that public support is needed. Bitts mentioned that the PCFFA can ask for support for the program also - all they need is an agreed upon package.

*Handout - Rode provided the CDFG perspective on short term needs for this year totaling about \$50,000. This is just a small part of a larger program. The total price tag is a lot larger.

Wilkinson - Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office (FWO) needs \$150,000 annually for monitoring coho and chinook.

*Handout - Silveira provided a table put together by the technical group on the Trinity side - a list of monitoring components by goals and objectives - helpful as a template.

*Handout - Bitts handed out a list of long-term monitoring needs.

*Handouts - Bernice Sullivan, BOR, handed out Basics for Program Management document to get ideas, and a long-term basic monitoring program for Sacramento/San Joaquin Estuary as an example.

McIsaac - we need to develop both short-term and long-term needs. Short-term to go into FY2000 budget proposal - for reallocation at Congressional level. Long-term need for FY2001.

**General agreement that before everyone leaves Friday we all identify a committee to work on short-term and long-term funding needs. Goal is to get preliminary package by end of March meeting.

McIsaac - TF needs to talk about how to proceed with immediate short-term needs.

RECESS

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING

February 24-26, 1999

Doubletree Hotel

Eureka, CA

1:00 PM Meeting of TF (held concurrently with KFMC meeting)

Present: Jim Bond (alternate for Troy Fletcher), Greg Bryant, Kent Bulfinch, John Engbring (Designated Federal Officer), Mitch Farro, Elwood Miller, Al Olson, Mike Rode, Don Russell, Joan Smith

1. Convene TF meeting and opening remarks - introduction of Laurie Simons (Designated Federal Officer presiding)

*Handout - A letter from Cindy Barry was provided explaining that she could not come to the meeting and that John Engbring is chairing until the TF elects a new chair.

Laurie Simons was introduced as the new lead staff for the Restoration Program at the Yreka office.

2. Business:

2a. Adoption of TF agenda - Engbring added discussions of the Compatibility Determination (farming on refuge lands) and the Yreka office budget information to the agenda after 3:15 on Thursday. Wilkinson requested a discussion of the status of mainstem spawning by Bruce Halstead at that time also. A report from the Technical Work Group by Mike Belchik was also added to the agenda for that time period.

****Motion** (Bulfinch) To adopt amended agenda**

****Second** (Smith)**

****Motion Carried****

2b. Adoption of TF minutes from the October 15-16, 1998 meeting

Russell phoned the Yreka office to ask that the reference in the October minutes to the Upper Basin Amendment be changed from the May 97 (revised version) to an earlier version. Wilkinson made the motion and all agree that the reference should be to the 1995 version on page 45 of the minutes for the October 98 meeting. Some typographical corrections were received from Cindy Barry. Grammatical errors were also found by Bob Anderson of the Department of Interior. Doug Tedrick provided these edits.

****Motion** (Russell) To approve the minutes once errors are corrected.**

****Second** (Bulfinch)**

****Motion Carried****

2c. Status of the request to reduce the \$80k for overhead

*Handout - a letter from the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Regional Office in Portland was provided. The letter explains why the overhead will remain and what it is used for.

Mike Spear would have liked to see a reduction, but it could not be done. The TF may consider asking again in future years.

2d. Status of the FWS request for an increased budget in FY2000

Cindy Barry included a request for a million dollar increase in FY2000 budget to our Washington D.C. office, but it was not approved. Some discussion about lobbying - FWS employees cannot lobby, but they can provide information. The TF may want to do some lobbying.

2e. Status of letter to DOI Secretary on Klamath gauges

*Handout - a draft letter from TF chair to Secretary Babbitt that was drafted last June by John Hamilton and Mike Belchik was provided. The letter describes the need for continued funding for Klamath gauges and harvest monitoring and escapement information.

Funding for gauges has been a problem every year since 1995. FWS funded Shasta and Scott gauges last year, but do not have the funds this year. Forest Service is dropping funding of two gauges this year. United States Geological Survey (USGS) has a

budget for gauges, but matched funding is required. The Technical Work Group (TWG) should prioritize the gauges, so we can try to get the minimum funded. They all are needed for hydrologic modeling. Maybe California Department of Water Resources (DWR) will joint fund with USGS - Rode will contact Bill Bennett about it. Greg Bryant will contact Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). John Engbring will talk with Steve Lewis about bringing up the issue at the California Water Commission meeting in March.

****Motion** (Smith) To send draft letter to Secretary Babbitt and cc: agencies. Chair or vice chair will sign it.**

****Second** (Russell)**

****Motion Carried****

2f. TF Appointment letters

Formal appointments of members to the TF were due last October (they are due every 4 years). The Chair will be sending out letters asking for appointment updates for everyone.

Surprise Cake for Kent Bulfinch's 82nd Birthday !!! - and coffee break

2g. Budget Committee appointments

The budget committee meeting last November had good representation. Engbring would like to make the budget committee member appointments. Mike Rode has a permanent appointment, and the other representatives are doing a good job, so we will send letters out appointing those that have been involved.

3. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence

Laurie Simons summarized the assignments and motions from the last meeting. Then she summarized the correspondence that came in. They are provided as handouts.

Agendum 3 Handout Letter to TF from Doug Hirsch dated October 16, 1998

Agendum 3 Handout Letter to Herger's office (Dave Meurer) dated October 27, 1998
Page 3 was missing from this handout. Will provide at next meeting.

Agendum 3 Handout Letter to Hatfield Working Group dated November 2, 1998

Agendum 3 Handout Letter to Herger's office (Dave Meurer) dated November 16, 1998

Agendum 3 Handout Letter from Roger Barnhart dated December 3, 1998. Original photographic attachments to this letter were passed around by Greg Bryant.

4. Liz Murgiya from Congressman Thompson's office and Chris Norin from Senator Feinstein's office were present but had to leave before we had the opportunity to introduce them. They spoke with Engbring during the long break with Bulfinch's cake.

5. Status report on 1999 annual operations plan and EIS on BOR Klamath Project (Wirkus)

*Handout provided by Carl Wirkus on weather conditions.

Snow pack is 103% of average, BOR expects similar operations to last year. Annual plan is coming out next week. Bernice Sullivan has put together an interagency group to work on the EIS for Klamath Project operations. A scoping letter summarizing the operations issues was sent out to interested parties with a 30 day comment period. All are invited to comment. A separate government to government meeting will be held with tribes, but they may comment to this scoping letter also if they wish.

6. Report on flow study budget development (Wirkus, Dugan)

Carl Wirkus of BOR discussed the itemized flow study budget put together by BOR to try to get funding for flow studies outside the current program budget. Regional Director Roger Patterson assigned it to staff in Klamath Falls. Larry Dugan was instrumental in this task. Larry coordinated with members of the Technical Work Group and others to come up with a comprehensive budget. The cost estimate was \$28 million, then \$22.5 million.

*Handout - copies of the BOR flow study budget were provided.

Mike Belchik said that the Technical Work Group had spent 1 1/2 years putting together a similar flow study package that totaled \$14 million. Differences between the budgets include: some of the TWG cost estimates were low, new studies were added by BOR. The TWG will do a comparison of the lists and provide comments to BOR.

7. Report on ongoing monitoring (Sullivan) - Bernice Sullivan already went over monitoring in the morning's joint session.

8. Report by USGS on priority reach of river (Flug)

*Handout provided by Marshall Flug on USGS Streamgaging Program.

Marshall Flug - USGS needs to know what is the next priority reach of the river to do water quality modeling and other flow study work. They also need to know what funding is available for this work. Mike Belchik stated that the TWG decided that the Shasta River is the next section to do work based on biological implications and the state of the watershed. Joan Smith would like the mainstem work done first. Kent Bulfinch believes the mainstem should be done first because it is a bottleneck to fish survival. The motion voted on at the October meeting included tributary work. The TF agreed that all of the work needs to get done, the question is which work to do first. Agreement could not be reached, so the discussion was closed.

9. Agendum nine was deleted.

RECESS

February 25, 1999

Present: Mike Belchik (non-voting for Troy Fletcher), Greg Bryant, Kent Bulfinch, John Engbring, Mitch Farro, Elwood Miller, Al Olson, Mike Orcutt, Ronnie Pierce (for Leaf Hillman), Mike Rode, Don Russell, Joan Smith.

Engbring reviewed the agenda. Need to add to agenda for this afternoon: Status of Mainstem Spawning, Assignment of a person to the Harvest Monitoring Committee, and a Report from the TWG Chair.

10. Election of chair and vice-chair

Engbring was nominated by Mike Spear to act as chair until a chair is selected by consensus vote. The TF needs to elect a chair.

****Motion** (Smith) To elect John Engbring as Chair.**

****Second** (Orcutt)**

****Nominations Closed** (Orcutt)**

****Motion Carried** (unanimous)**

Kent Bulfinch proposes that the vice chair position be rotated among non-federal members in alphabetical order by group the member represents. This would give everyone an opportunity. In the past the position has been a lifetime position, but the procedures describe a year or two year appointment. There was a period when the vice chair chaired a number of meetings, but Engbring says he plans to attend all meetings. Robert's Rules of Order are not strictly followed, so a strong background in them is really not necessary. Engbring verified that it is a problem for federal employees to sign some documents, so it would be useful to have a non-federal vice chair. Rode is willing to serve as CDFG representative. Elwood Miller is not willing to serve. Dave Bitts representing California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry would be the next vice chair. If he is not willing to serve, Mike Rode will do so.

****Motion** (Bulfinch) To suspend the Task Force Operating Procedures regarding the Vice Chair and replace it with the following: The Vice Chair position would rotate alphabetically by representation among non-federal members of the TF that are willing to serve. The term of office is 2 consecutive meetings. If, for any reason a Vice Chair could not serve, it would go to the next person on the list.**

****Second** (Russell)**

****Motion Carried** (Farro, Pierce, and Miller abstain)**

11. Mid-program review

* Two Handouts - Comments on the Mid-Program Review draft document from Don Russell and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

The Final Draft of the Mid-program review done by Kier and Associates was distributed to TF members. A presentation of the main points and recommendations was provided by Bill Kier, Pat Higgins, and Andrea Tuttle.

Chapter 1 is an overview - It starts out describing what the TF has done right over the years. These are on page 1-1 of the document.

Chapters 2-9 cover each of the tasks of the contract.

Chapter 10 is an assessment of the contribution of hatcheries, requested by Yreka FWO.

The chapters were discussed in more detail, but out of order:

Bill Kier covered the following:

Chapter 4 describes the non-federally funded contribution to the restoration effort.

Cooperators have a good handle on the funds brought in from other sources, but not the in-kind contributions. Funds show about 80% match of projects - but this is likely much higher. A recommendation is that cooperators report funds from all sources so they can be tracked.

Chapter 7 discusses to what extent TF is allocating projects to itself. Agency representatives received 62% of TF funds, especially in earlier years. Independent landowners were not organized in the beginning, but their participation has increased over the years.

Chapter 8 covers the effectiveness and workload of the Yreka FWO. Workload has steadily increased over time. Figure 8.2 shows that many projects are multi-year, leading to an increasing accumulation of projects active at any one time. The curve shows changes in the FWO workforce to go up to 5 and then down to 3.5 staff even as the number of active projects has increased. Table 8.1 compares other agencies administering grant proposals compared to Yreka FWO. There appear to be two types of organizations: 1) Foundations - provide funding, only cursory reporting requirements, 2) Others do much more ground work with grantees, stringent environmental compliance requirements. Yreka FWO falls within the range of similar programs of the second type.

Chapter 9 asks the question of whether the public is better informed about fishery restoration since the beginning of the program. Newspapers in Klamath Falls and Yreka had increasing numbers of stories on fishery issues. Newspapers in Eureka and Del Norte County did not. These areas were already covering fishery issues. School programs have been active over this time period. Bulfinch mentioned that schools have a lot more programs funded by other sources and this would be useful to get in the document.

Dr. Andrea Tuttle reviewed the following:

Chapter 6 - discusses how the TF works as a body. All members were interviewed - detailed (anonymous) notes are provided in Appendix 2.2. It is highly recommended that TF members read through this appendix. There is more agreement than we likely think. It was easy for us all to complain about the process, but remember the successes: the heavy lifting of getting a program going, have competing interests, finite water supplies, finite fish, finite funds, get a budget out every year, TWG provides free professional advice, staff runs an office and keeps TF legal, have a plan, do outreach to others in the basin. This program is unique.

Basic problems include: 1) Need a refresher course on consensus. The idea of consensus is that we need to continue to work through issues to come up with something that is better than no. Need to get to yes. A facilitator could help when the group gets stuck on something to identify areas of agreement and move on. 2) Annual cycle for funding projects means that projects are dealt with almost every meeting. Most feel the process is pretty good, but some would like to see projects targeted more to fit priorities, maybe have a targeted RFP. 3) Accountability - money goes out, poor process bringing back the results of the projects. More quality control of final reports would help feed information back into the funding process. 4) Administrative costs. 40% of funds go to project administration, 8% to planning, 52% to projects. Other agencies donate overhead costs, send representatives here, why not FWS? Environmental compliance standards are higher than non-federal. FWS needs to continue to pursue general permitting to streamline environmental compliance process. 5) Increase interactions between TF and KFMC 6) Need to better support TWG.

Chapter 2 assesses how well the 5 goals of the program are being met. Time spent in meetings on different topics shows that some topics could be dropped e.g. upper basin amendment. Recommendations on the minutes: place minutes into a table/database to do sorts on them.

Need to start working on sub-basin planning and use plans as a source of future agenda items.

Pat Higgins discussed the following:

Chapter 2 also assesses fish populations. Data from 1998 were added since the earlier draft. Overall, the Klamath/Trinity basin has been cyclical. Populations dropped in 1998 probably due to El Nino. Mainstem conditions seem to have significant problems, especially with steelhead.

Chapter 10 - Hatcheries. Iron Gate Dam steelhead broodstock have failed - mainstem conditions are so bad that eggs can't hatch. Most small scale hatcheries have not provided much benefits.

Chapter 3 assesses every policy and task from the long-range plan. In Appendix 3.1 the long-range plan recommendations were consolidated - the TF could use this consolidated list to update the long-range plan. Recommend funding FP (fish studies, monitoring) in other ways. FR (small scale hatcheries)- has now been dropped, good improvement. It would be useful to see how much funding coming from CDFG in the basin. Chapter 3 has some continuing recommendations after covering prior recommendations.

Chapter 5 - Habitat trends. Appendix 5 has more details, can also see them on KRIS. The lower Klamath habitat quality has decreased. Salmon River habitat quality has not declined, but needs road decommissioning. Scott River has shown good cooperation, French Creek is doing well. Shasta River has water quality problems that became worse in the drought. Good riparian restoration efforts in the Shasta Basin survived the 1997 storm. The mainstem Klamath is the most troubling. Upper Klamath Lake is in crisis with increasing algae and decreasing dissolved oxygen. This problem needs to be looked at. Need to improve water quality of tributaries and the river below Iron Gate Dam.

Bill Kier went over their most important recommendations:

- 1) Look at Chapter 3 - tried to update and streamline LRP to make it a better record to track efforts. Maybe need to have a subcommittee work on the coding system to use as a basis of annual reporting.
- 2) Get together with KFMC and find a good, stable funding source for fish monitoring. \$1.3 million has come from restoration funding to support monitoring. It is a potential O&M item for the Bureau of Reclamation.
- 3) Turn up the heat on the sub-basin planning efforts. CRMPs are turning out plans - have TWG look them over and adopt them into the LRP.
- 4) Get together with NMFS and the State Resources Agency to discuss our program being recognized as the Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Plan for the basin. The \$100 million for the west coast looks like its coming from Congress. A lot of the problems are that we have very little money for a great deal of work - additional money could really help.
- 5) Take to heart Andrea Tuttle's recommendation on consensus - getting to yes. Take a retreat, get a facilitator, practice on an issue.

Comments on the draft report are due to FWS and Kier in 30 days. Kier is looking for typos and errors. Pat Higgins can be available to answer questions at a future meeting.

Engbring wants TF to figure out how they wish to use the report. Need to get an agenda item at the next meeting to go over the five recommendations.

12. FY2000 Budget Committee recommendations and FY2000 RFP development

a. Funding levels for categories

*Handout - Minutes from Budget Committee meeting last November.

Table 1 on the last page shows the allocation of funds in the different categories. It was assumed that the 8% overhead from the FWS Regional Office would be dropped, but this was not approved. It should not come out of Yreka FWO budget because the 341,000 is minimum. Therefore, it needs to come out of the 3 categories. Several members expressed a desire to continue to ask that the overhead be funded by other FWS funds. Asking again next year, and asking congressional representatives to look into it were two ideas discussed.

****Motion** (Rode) The \$80,000 should be deducted proportionately from category 1 (40% or \$32,000) and categories 2**

and 3 (30% and \$24,000 each).

****Second** (Olson)**

****Motion Carried** (Orcutt, Pierce, Smith abstain)**

Fletcher suggested that category 2 (sub-basin planning and CRMPs) funding be equally divided among sub-basin planning areas. This was recommended by the TWG last year, but the TF never did it. Bulfinch and others are supportive, but would like to review accomplishments and possibly hold future funding decisions contingent upon accomplishments. Results of the mid-program review should factor into accomplishments also. Smith suggested that an annual plan for the coming year's activities and a review of past activities would provide good review criteria. CRMPs would continue to go through the RFP process, but would not be ranked with the rest of the projects. TF will provide more information later on what will need to be included in the annual reports due in June.

****Motion** (Fletcher) In regard to the TF FY2000 budget category 2, funding in this category would be divided up equally among the 5 sub-basin areas: Salmon River, Scott River, Shasta River, Mid Klamath, Lower Klamath. Each sub-basin planning effort would have to submit a proposal including a yearly reporting requirement associated with annual activities (due in June). This action is intended for FY2000 only and is not binding on future funding years.**

****Second** (Bulfinch)**

****Motion Carried** (Russell and Farro abstain)**

b. KFMC's Technical Advisory Team (TAT) to assist TWG with ranking harvest management proposals

Fletcher brought a formal recommendation from the KFMC that the TAT would assist the TWG with ranking harvest monitoring proposals. When the TWG reviews the proposals, some TAT members should be present to provide comments on the harvest management proposals. The TAT would provide input and only TWG members would vote. Belchik said that there are no problems with implementation, but that logistics would likely increase, and per diem costs would increase because additional attendance would be required at the ranking meeting. The TAT would prioritize harvest monitoring proposals, but the TWG would still have to compare harvest monitoring with other proposals in category 3.

****Motion** (Fletcher) That harvest monitoring technical review needs pertaining to the Task Force budget be coordinated between the Technical Work Group (TWG) and the Klamath Fishery Management Council's Technical Advisory Team (TAT). In addition, this would include that proposals received by the Technical Work Group regarding harvest management would jointly be reviewed with the TAT.**

****Second** (Smith)**

****Motion Carried****

c. RFP revisions

*Handout provided - last year's RFP packet. This year's RFP will go out in about 2 weeks, with a due date 60 days later (early May). Asked for any changes to the RFP. Belchik asked if there was anything about harvest management. Rode offered that it is covered by category 3.

d. Set asides

Marshall Flug asked if the TF will set aside funding to support young of the year and adult spawning surveys as was done last year. The effort is a 2 year effort, but only one year was set aside last year.

Nat Bingham had written a letter to USGS asking them to stay in the basin. USGS said they would if funding was assured, so the TF assured the funding for last year. Now it is not assured, but USGS is committed to staying in the basin. Salaries are covered, but almost no operating funds. Engbring asked if TF wants to set aside funds or let a proposal compete with other proposals. The work would be a flow study element, so Fletcher recommended waiting to see if it gets funded with the flow study by Congress. Rode expressed concern with the TF budget getting eroded away causing decreasing funds for on the ground projects. Engbring agreed that taking projects off the top should be extraordinary and decided to go forward with the budget the way it is now.

14. Development of a strategy to pursue additional funding

It was decided to do item 14 before 13. Felice Pace reviewed efforts to pursue additional funding. KFA has a new director, and Pace is focusing on fisheries issues now. KFA had prepared a non-federal sign on letter requesting \$3 million per year (an increase of \$2 million per year earmarked for projects). He stated that there was a lack of budget requests coming from FWS last year. There needs to be better documentation of needs to use now. Sub-basin plans also need better documentation to

show we are getting better projects on the ground. Yreka FWO requested an additional \$1 million - good support for other requests. Maybe next year we can get further.

CDFG funding increase is making a big difference - it resulted from MOU with NMFS. Pace raised a concern about how much TF should invest in upgrading roads on private lands - need to figure out the public/private benefits. TF sent a letter to Herger supporting the proposal for flow study funding - good effort. Congressman Thompson should be able to help. Senator Boxer is no longer on Appropriations. Because Senator Feinstein is now on Appropriations, we need to work more with her.

Clean Water Initiative of the Administration will bring new funding. Shasta River is a priority watershed for this program. California Water Commission should be contacted. The President's Salmon Initiative is likely to get \$25 million in partnership with the states - local partnerships will be important. Lands Legacy Initiative may provide FY2000 funds for local land and water trusts to purchase lands or conservation easements or water rights. Local control will be a plus. The initiative would use Land and Water Conservation funds.

Impediments we can work on: We are poorer than north and south of us. We are less able to compete for funds. We need to pursue new opportunities. Our fragmented budgets makes it more difficult to ask for funds with all of the various agencies.

Recommendations: Consider asking key province representatives of agencies to bring all budgets together to get one unified federal budget for FY2001. Also, tribes and states could develop a unified budget to show efforts on watershed now. Do not subsume existing budgets, but show what all the needs are for increased budgets. Klamath Forest Alliance (KFA) would be willing to circulate something for comment and get signatures, and use it to lobby. Can we get the agricultural community to sign on? And counties? He is looking for direction from non-federal members.

13. Identify long-term priority funding needs

Troy Fletcher concurs with Felice's proposal to put together a complete budget. KFMC is setting up a subcommittee to list specific harvest monitoring needs. Fletcher recommends that TF piggyback onto this effort and list off other needs to make the list complete. The Klamath could easily use \$10 million per year for the next 20 years including \$2-3 million for the flow study per year over 5 or 6 years. Trinity has spent \$7.5 million per year in the past. Fletcher proposes to expand the responsibilities of the harvest monitoring committee to include all restoration components. The three main components are: flow study, harvest monitoring, and habitat restoration. Engbring will promote the flow study, do we need to have the other components done before asking for funds?

Fletcher says there is overlap between harvest monitoring and the flow study. What is the best way to package? Belchik brought up other monitoring needs such as ESA population monitoring, land management monitoring, and others. We need to make sure these are included. Bryant suggested that the Klamath PIEC and PAC have tackled these same issues. This group could discuss it with them and coalesce a proposal with them. The next PAC meeting is in Klamath Falls next week. We could also look at a contrast with CVPIA and Bonneville Power Administration.

Farro suggested that we need to make sure the short term needs are not on hold until the big package is done. Fletcher reported that the KFMC is talking about a short term need being addressed by the proposal for the TAT to work with the TWG. The medium term need should be addressed by a \$400,000 request being put together for the FY2000 budget. The long term need proposal should be put together by the subcommittee and sent to Congress. Engbring asked if we need more TF members to the subcommittee besides Fletcher and Orcutt. He suggested that the Yreka FWO be notified of the meetings and Yreka will notify all TF members in case they wish to attend.

14a. Additions to the Agenda

Engbring wants to add three new items to the agenda: 1) a discussion on the recent FWS compatibility determination of refuge goals with farming, 2) a presentation on of the status of spawner surveys in the mainstem, 3) a report from TWG chair. Smith asked is we could have as a standing agenda item to get an update from the TWG - yes.

1) Compatibility determination

* Handout - January 11, 1999 letter from the FWS on National Wildlife Refuge compatibility determination with farming.

Steve Lewis gave the background on this determination. FWS has been working on it for over a year. Three laws require that the determination be made. 1966 Refuge Administration Act, 1977 Refuge Improvement Act, 1964 Kuchel Act. The Kuchel Act requires that farming be consistent with waterfowl management. The determination was that farming on refuge lands is consistent with the refuge program provided that wetlands receive the full scheduled water delivery. In dry years, lease lands

may not receive water to allow for wetlands use. This had led to concerns regarding impacts to farming. Lease land renewals have added language stating that water would be provided depending on supplies. Because there is a lot of water this year, the EA development has been delayed and will be out in 3-4 months to describe implementation and collect public input. Renewals were February 24, and a meeting is scheduled for next week to explain the plan. The leases are for seven years for alfalfa.

Smith is concerned for farmers and the county if farmers do not get enough water. She is also concerned about the notification being late. Siskiyou County asked to be included in decision-making and be notified before a decision is made. She asked Tom Stewart to set up a meeting and hasn't heard of this meeting before this. The agricultural community asked for the amendment to be taken off because there is plenty of water and without discussions it is unreasonable.

Lewis said the lease revenue has been about \$200 million and about 70 or 80 families farm. Russell is concerned about the small farm families that depend on this water. The FWS is looking at alternatives to address the effect on people. Belchik described how the Lower Klamath Lake used to be the size of Upper Klamath Lake. Loss of the lake has changed the hydrology drastically and these effects are not fully understood. One of the greatest opportunities to restore water quality on the Klamath River will be to restore the wetlands up there - wetland loss has impacted salmon through water quantity and quality limitations. Lewis reminded the group that the Restoration Conference will be in Klamath Falls on March 10 and 11.

2) Spawner Surveys in Mainstem

*Handout provided summarizing the spawner survey results

Bruce Oppenheim of the Arcata FWO discussed results of the spawner surveys. One of the questions we are trying to answer is "Why are spawning salmon using certain areas?" Temperatures were not significantly different between redd areas and in the gravel. Bryant noted that the temperatures are warm and that normally the temperature difference below the surface and in the gravel is more like .3 or .4 degrees - this study only found .1 degree difference. Oppenheim concurred that they were looking for greater differences. Redd sites are being compared with habitat variables to look for correlations. Most of the redds were up by Iron Gate Dam. The complete report is available to members by request. Just this last year, a lot of fish were found suffering from bacterial gill disease in anecdotal accounts on the lower stretch of the river on the Yurok Reservation. Approximately 30-40% of the fish died prior to spawning this year, probably because they were crowding onto the best habitat. In prior years only 20-30% were estimated. This year water temperatures were high at Iron Gate Dam - which could cause problems. The run was not real high this year. Oppenheim thanked the TF for the funding for this project.

3) Report from Technical Work Group Chair, Mike Belchik

Mike Belchik discussed two main topics from the last TWG meeting:

a) How can we get the sub-basin planning effort back on track? We need to start meshing the RFP with the sub-basin plans. We need to start working better with CRMPs. We invited the heads of all CRMPs to the next TWG meeting - they are coming next week. We will have an informal round table discussion of this topic on the second day.

b) Mike Deas, UC Davis Hydraulic Engineer, reported to the TWG on the hourly temperature and water quality model he is doing under an agreement. Unexpected temperature results were found in the model results. As expected, Iron Gate Dam stratifies in summer. The hatchery takes cold water in the bottom and oxygenates it. They take most of the cold water. This affects the shape of the hypolimnion throughout the summer.

Rivers normally have diel temperature fluctuations. Often below dams, rivers have steady water temperatures. Right at Iron Gate Dam, temperature fluctuation is only one degree centigrade with temperatures in the low twenties. Eight miles down stream there are diel fluctuations. Further downstream, the fluctuation goes away. This is about where the water is located after a 24 hour travel time from the dam. (The water is subject to a full day and night.) Then further downstream, the diel pattern returns. There are trout right below the dam, but not down near Beaver Creek. There is a kill zone caused by the high temperatures. Deas predicted this pattern and found it was happening with monitors in the river. It was clear that temperatures need to be lower. The Shasta Dam release is 12E C which is very low. There used to be thermal refugia, but they do not exist anymore with Iron Gate Dam. Walker Bridge area is the first reversion zone. Why only in last ten years has the fish declined when Iron Gate Dam has been around longer? Not sure.

Bryant said the Sacramento example was a result of a NMFS consultation on winter run chinook salmon - they have a 56E F release there. Thermal blocks are a problem on the Klamath like the San Joaquin. It may help to look at the San Joaquin reports.

The TWG will be working on flow study recommendations and organizing study questions so we can guide scopes of work.

RECESS

February 26

Present:

Dave Bitts, Greg Bryant, Kent Bulfinch, John Engbring, Troy Fletcher, Al Olson, Mike Orcutt, Ronnie Pierce (for Leaf Hillman), Mike Rode, Don Russell, Joan Smith, and Keith Wilkinson.

15. Wrap up of unfinished business from prior meetings**a. Draft letter for TF endorsement**

Olson drafted a letter for TF signature to Klamath NF emphasizing the need to fund escapement monitoring. It is becoming difficult to obtain money for these efforts. California is not as successful at getting fishery money in the USFS. The Klamath gets 70% of anadromous fish money for California, but most of it goes to areas north of California. USFS needs to work with the monitoring committee to get the costs of this monitoring identified and included in their list. Olson will circulate his draft letter to some TF members and then send it to the Yreka FWO to be finalized and sent out. The letter will recommend to the USFS that escapement monitoring is important to fund.

b. Appointments to Budget Committee

Engbring wants to finalize appointments to the Budget Committee as described in the operating procedures. The tribal representative will be Mike Orcutt - he accepts. Keith Wilkinson will be fishery representative, Mike Rode will be DFG representative, need one at-large representative, this will be Joan Smith, Don Russell was it in the past. Engbring will be Interior representative. We will send out formal appointment letters to the budget committee.

c. Vice Chair in first rotation

Engbring wants to finalize who will be vice chair in the first rotation. If Dave Bitts is willing to serve, he will be first. Dave Bitts is willing to do the June meeting, but he may be fishing and not here. If that happens, Mike Rode will be vice chair.

d. Priority Reach of River

Engbring brought up this earlier topic to try to get to resolution for USGS, but discussion did not lead to consensus. Some want to go with the recommendations of the TWG to move USGS flow study efforts to the tributaries, while others want to heal the mainstem first because it doesn't make sense to generate fish in the tributaries to die in the mainstem. Engbring pointed out that this is merely study to get the entire picture, not a decision to make management changes in the tributaries. Pages 34 and 35 of minutes from the February 23, 1998 meeting were read by Russell - it states that the TF supports USGS involvement in the tributaries. Smith contends that the agreement was to work on the entire basin, but the disagreement is about where to go first.

e. Draft Mid-term Program Review

Pierce wants to talk about the processing of the document. The report is still a draft, what is the process to make substantive changes to it? Kier said he would respond to factual and editorial comments. But opinions and analysis is his independent contribution. Anyone with factual errors to report should give them to Yreka FWO to forward to Kier.

f. Regional Office (8%) overhead

Pierce wants to talk about the 8% overhead for the Regional Office again. The Klamath Act states that the Secretary and CDFG shall provide TF with administrative services. It further states that the funds will not be used to reimburse any agency for any staff time spent on TF duties. We should consider a motion to send a letter to Secretary Babbitt asking how Interior can take that money out of the budget. This issue keeps coming up, and requests have been made and rejected in the past. The group does not want to spend a lot of time on this issue because it may not be fruitful, but if Pierce will write up a letter, TF will consider it at the next meeting. The letter should ask for all administrative costs to be funded by other sources, not just the Regional Office share. Smith recommended that we also ask for an interpretation from the Solicitor's Office. Pierce will provide a draft letter at the next meeting.

16. Recap and summary of decisions/assignments from this meeting

Simons reviewed assignments from joint KFMC/TF meeting:

First is to appoint members to harvest management committee.

Smith wants to clarify who the representatives are that will be serving on the committee, as well as leaving it open to anyone who wants to attend. It is to be a combination of volunteers and members who are already on the committee. Mike Rode volunteered to serve. Fletcher summarized: Joe Polos, Bernice Sullivan, Dave Bitts, Mike Rode, Keith Wilkinson, Fletcher and whoever else wants to attend. He stressed that is important to know who will coordinate and distribute meeting notices. Fletcher thinks that Ron Iverson or Joe Polos would be best to distribute meeting notices. He can assist if it is to be held in the Eureka area. If it is to be held somewhere up the Klamath River, he thinks it would be appropriate that the Yreka office work on the scheduling.

Wilkinson: Wants to clarify that the people Fletcher mentioned were for the short term (the FY 2000 shortfall) and Ron Iverson was going to head that committee. For the long term, the group expanded to bring in Bernice Sullivan, who had come before the Council and presented a format for a long term program.

Engbring: Restated that there will be two different tracks, short term and long term, with overlap of members.

Wilkinson brought up the inclusion of Mary Ellen Mueller, who has extensive experience in the Washington, D.C. arena, to serve on the long-term committee.

Pierce requested that the notices be sent to all Task Force and technical group members, and that her name be included on the list.

Engbring suggested sending notices to Task Force members, who can then inform their representatives on the technical groups when they want technical participation.

Fletcher responded that it would be best just to send to all, because there are a few technical team members that aren't officially represented on the Council. The monitoring discussions will be technical, and should include policy people AND technical people. It needs to be a good mixture. He suggested leaving it to the Yreka office to decide to whom to send the announcements.

Pierce said it was her understanding that monitoring issues should be discussed at the April meeting.

Polos said that he was calling a meeting before the next Management Council meeting (the following Sunday) during the week to come up with the list that L.B. Boydston had requested. Mike McCain will be there, several technical team members, local CDFG staff, tribal biologists, people who have been working on those issues for some time. With harvest management issues, a lot of has been done before and it is important to get everyone together to update on the latest costs of what they have been doing.

That is the short term plan, to happen within the week and to be presented to the Management Council on Sunday.

Wilkinson: Explained that the reason for the haste was that Boydston thought there was a chance for FY2000 funding from the PSMFC. The long term would go into FY 2001 budget, with a larger group to discuss not only monitoring funding but operational costs as a whole.

Polos stated that his short term group would focus on meeting the funding needs that come up throughout the year, i.e. for scale sampling, spawning ground surveys, etc. Things needed to execute the fisheries. The focus is on the needs of harvest monitoring.

Simons continues to review the assignments and motions, from this point forward from the Task Force only meeting, not the joint meeting. See the list of assignments and motions below.

Regarding Fletcher's Agendum 12 motion regarding sub-basin reporting requirements, Mike Rode brought up the lack of a mechanism for informing the CRMPs of the reporting requirement. Suggests amending the RFP to include the reporting requirement. Cannot expect the level of reporting which all have agreed is necessary at this June's Task Force meeting, but at subsequent meetings. Need to put CRMPs on notice for the future. Rode suggested drafting a letter requesting the attendance of CRMP members at the June 1999 Task Force meeting and explaining future reporting requirements. Pierce pointed out that reporting requirement was not part of last year's funding, how can they be expected to report at this June's meeting? Fletcher suggested again drafting a letter stating that the CRMPs would be expected in FY 2000 to provide a report to the Task Force with a description and update of activities. Engbring suggested repeating the motion that passed in the letter to make CRMPs aware. Laurie Simons to draft the letter. Fletcher also wants to include that the Task Force would be taking up the issue of sub

basin planning and will be specifically discussing criteria for CRMP performance. Smith suggested that the CRMPs provide a summary of activities at the June 1999 Task Force meeting. Iverson stated that there is a reporting requirement for all agreements, but Bulfinch pointed out that the CRMP obtains funding from other sources and it would be helpful to the technical work groups to be informed of work being done.

Agreed that letter would be drafted informing the CRMPs of the motion, of being included on the June Task Force agenda, and that they would be expected to report in a written format on their activities in FY 2000.

Farro understood that reports of performance would be the basis for evaluation by the Technical Work Group as to standards met for dollars expended.

Specifics of reporting requirements will be given at June meeting.

Regarding Fletcher's Agendum 12 motion regarding joint review of harvest management proposals by the Technical Work Group and Klamath Council Technical Advisory Team, Orcutt advised that some issues, i.e. outmigrant sampling, that come before the groups under the guise of harvest management will not be what the groups come up with. Polos replied that long term projects will not necessarily be strictly harvest management issues, but short term discussion will be restricted to harvest management issues.

Bitts suggested that this same recap format be used at Management Council meetings.

17. Set the dates and locations for the next two meetings. Identify agenda items for the next meeting.

Different locations for the next meetings were discussed. The group settled on Klamath Falls for the June meeting to take advantage of the Water Festival at that time. The October meeting will be in Yreka. The June meeting will be June 23 and 24. The October meeting will be October 14 and 15 unless there is a conflict with KFMC.

Agenda items for the next meeting:

- Budget items - probably need 30 minutes
- Ranking of proposals
- Review mid-program review - include 2 hours discussion of where do we go from here?
- Quick updates from CRMPs - give them 15 or 20 minutes each
- Flow Study - FWS, Hardy, BOR, TWG - 30 minutes
- Progress toward an organized community effort to secure more funding - update on long-term and short-term funding
- Should we have a retreat before October meeting?
- Klamath EIS
- Old business - letter to Secretary Babbitt on administrative costs

ADJOURN

KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING
Handouts Provided at Meeting

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Agendum C Handout | CDFG Klamath River Budget Shortage FY 98/99 |
| Agendum C Handout | Klamath Basin Monitoring Needs - Table from staff |
| Agendum C Handout | Long-term Monitoring Recommendations from Dave Bitts |
| Agendum C Handout | Basic Concepts for Program Management from Sullivan |
| Agendum C Handout | Long-term Monitoring Program Example - Sacramento/San Joaquin Estuary |
| Agendum 1 Handout | Letter from Cindy Barry dated February 22, 1999 |
| Agendum 2c Handout | Letter from FWS regarding 8% overhead dated January 29, 1999 |
| Agendum 2e Handout | Draft letter to Interior Secretary on Klamath gauges |
| Agendum 3 Handout | Letter to TF from Doug Hirsch dated October 16, 1998 |
| Agendum 3 Handout | Letter to Herger's office (Dave Meurer) dated October 27, 1998 |
| Agendum 3 Handout | Letter to Hatfield Working Group dated November 2, 1998 |
| Agendum 3 Handout | Letter to Herger's office (Dave Meurer) dated November 16, 1998 |
| Agendum 3 Handout | Letter from Roger Barnhart dated December 3, 1998 |
| Agendum 5 Handout | Klamath Basin Hydrologic Update February 23, 1999 |
| Agendum 6 Handout | Flow Study Budget for Klamath River, Bureau of Reclamation February 10, 1999 |
| Agendum 8 Handout | Information on USGS Streamgaging Program |
| Agendum 11 Handout | Memo from Don Russell regarding the Mid Program Review dated December 14, 1998 |
| Agendum 11 Handout | Copy of Fish and Wildlife Service comments on Mid-Program Review sent to Bill Kier dated December 17, 1998 |
| Agendum 12 Handout | Minutes from Budget Committee Meeting November 20, 1998 |
| Agendum 12 Handout | FY 1999 RFP packet |
| Agendum 14.a.1. Handout | Letter from Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuges on the Lease Land Farming Program Compatibility Determination, dated January 11, 1999 |
| Agendum 14.a.2. Handout | Abstract of Results of Spawner Surveys, Arcata FWO |

Informational Handouts

Newspaper article on 2nd Annual TF/Nat Bingham Award

Fiscal Year 1998 Cost Accounting, Klamath Fishery Restoration Program

Press release on 2nd Annual TF/Nat Bingham Award

Letter from Klamath Basin National Wildlife Refuges on the lease land farming program, dated January 11, 1999

Assignments and Motions from Task Force meeting of February 24-26, 1999, in Eureka, California

Assignment from Joint Session with Klamath Fisheries Management Council (Feb 24):

Agendum C: Before everyone leaves on Friday, we should appoint members to a Harvest Monitoring Committee to identify harvest monitoring needs. There needs to be a representative from KFMC, TF, DFG, and another representative that is on both TF and KFMC (a crossover rep).

Assignments from Task Force Session:

Agendum 2b: **Staff** will change reference to the Upper Basin technical document on page 45 of minutes of October 1998 meeting from the May 1997 version to the October 1995 version.

Agendum 2b: **Staff** will make the typographical corrections to October 1998 minutes from Cindy Barry.

Agendum 2b: **Staff** will correct October 1998 minutes as requested by Doug Tedrick.

Agendum 2e: **Mike Rode** will contact Bill Bennett about getting funding for unfunded gauges.

Agendum 2e: **Greg Bryant** will contact EPA about funding for unfunded gauges.

Agendum 2e: **John Engbring** will talk with Steve Lewis about requesting funding for unfunded gauges at California Water Commission meeting in March.

Agendum 2f: **Staff** will send out letters requesting TF membership appointments to be updated.

Agendum 3: **Staff** will include in future minutes the summary of motions and assignments.

Agendum 6: **Engbring** will work to get Flow Study funding in FY 2001 budget. Mary Ellen Mueller will help with this effort.

Agendum 10: **Staff** will ask Dave Bitts if he is willing to serve as Vice Chair for the next meeting. If not, it will be Mike Rode (alphabetically by representation).

Agendum 11: **Staff** will include discussion of the 5 recommendations from the Mid-program Review on the agenda for next meeting.

Agendum 12: **Staff** will mail out an RFP like last year's RFP in about 2 weeks.

Agendum 13: **Fletcher** will notify Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office when the meeting of the Harvest Monitoring Committee will be and the **Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office** will notify all TF members in case they wish to attend.

Agendum 13: **Staff** will place an update from the TWG on all future TF agendas.

Motions Passed from Task Force Session:

Agendum 2a:

****Motion** (Bulfinch) To approve the amended agenda.**

****Second** (Smith)**

****Motion Carried****

Agendum 2b:

****Motion** (Russell) To approve the minutes once errors are corrected.**

****Second** (Bulfinch)**

****Motion Carried****

Agendum 2e:

****Motion** (Smith) To send draft letter to Secretary Babbitt and cc: agencies. Chair or vice chair will sign it.**

****Second** (Russell)**

****Motion Carried****

Agendum 10:

****Motion** (Smith) To elect John Engbring as Chair.**

****Second** (Orcutt)**

****Nominations Closed** (Orcutt)**

****Motion Carried****

Agendum 10:

****Motion** (Bulfinch) To suspend the Task Force Operating Procedures regarding the Vice Chair and replace it with the following: The Vice Chair position would rotate alphabetically by representation among non-federal member of the TF that are willing to serve. The term of office is 2 consecutive meetings. If, for any reason a Vice Chair could not serve, it would go to the next person on the list.**

****Second** (Russell)**

****Motion Carried** (Farro, Pierce, and Miller abstain)**

Agendum 12:

****Motion** (Rode) The \$80,000 should be deducted proportionately from category 1 (40% or \$32,000) and categories 2 and 3 (30% and \$24,000 each).**

****Second** (Olson)**

****Motion Carried** (Orcutt, Pierce, Smith abstain)**

Agendum 12:

****Motion** (Fletcher) In regard to the TF FY2000 budget category 2, funding in this category would be divided up equally among the 5 sub-basin areas: Salmon River, Scott River, Shasta River, Mid Klamath, Lower Klamath. Each sub-basin planning effort would have to submit a proposal including a yearly reporting requirement associated with annual activities (due in June). This action is intended for FY2000 only and is not binding on future funding years.**

****Second** (Smith)**

****Motion Carried** (Russell and Farro abstain)**

Agendum 12:

****Motion** (Fletcher) That harvest monitoring technical review needs pertaining to the Task Force budget be coordinated between the Technical Work Group and the Klamath Fishery Management Council's Technical Advisory Team (TAT). In addition, this would include that proposals received by the Technical Work Group regarding harvest management would jointly be reviewed with the TAT.**

****Second** (Smith)**

****Motion Carried****